

REMARKS

Claim 27 was pending and under consideration in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-26 were cancelled in a previous amendment and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of May 5, 2009, claim 27 was rejected.

With this Amendment, claim 27 is amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated *Nishizawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,122,881) in view of *Arakawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,571). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites a pixel unit having a selection circuit between a horizontal reset line and a reset element which is configured to provide a reset signal to the reset element or a selection signal to a selection element.

This clearly unlike *Nishizawa* or *Arakawa* which both fail to disclose or even fairly suggest a pixel unit having a selection circuit between a horizontal reset line and a reset element which is configured to provide a reset signal to the reset element or a selection signal to a selection element. Instead, *Nishizawa* discloses two switching transistors, where one transistor transfers a photoelectric converting voltage from a yellow color pixel to a terminal and the other transistor transfers a photoelectric converting voltage from a green color pixel to a second terminal. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,122,881, Col. 4, l. 52-68. *Arakawa* merely discloses using a reset transistor, a voltage dividing circuit and a source follower circuit. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,031,571, Col. 6, l. 22-34.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a pixel unit having a selection circuit between a horizontal reset line and a reset element which is configured to provide a reset signal to the reset element or a selection signal to a selection element, the photodiode is

completely reset and fixed pattern noise is eliminated thereby increasing image quality. See, 2004/0080644, Para. [0087].

Therefore, because *Nishizawa, Arakawa* or any combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every feature of claim 27, the rejection cannot stand.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 23, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000